REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-25, 27, 28 and 69-87 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 22, 27, 28, 70, 72-74, 76-82 and 84 have been amended, and claim 75 has been cancelled. The claims have been amended to incorporate previously presented subject matter, or to correct typographical errors relating to dependency, or to change antecedent basis based on the claim amendments. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 1-25, 27-28, 69-74 and 76-87 will be pending in this application. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 27 is objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 27 to overcome these objections. Thus, the objections to this claim are now moot.

Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claim 27.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-12, 17-25, 27, 73-78, 80-82, 84, 86, and 87 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being unpatentable over Dalal (US 2002/0093931 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Further, this rejection is moot with respect to claim 75, which has been cancelled.

Applicant has amended the independent claims to define the recited "information" as comprising "voice data," which is previously presented subject matter.[1] Further, some of the independent claims have been amended to define the OTA protocol as being different from the IP protocol, which also is previously presented subject matter.[2] Additionally, independent claim 22 has been further amended to recite that the wireless device does not support IP, which also is previously presented subject matter.[3] Thus, no new issues are raised.

---

[1] *See, e.g.*, previously presented claim 73 ("digitized voice, or digital data"), as well as previously presented claims 10, 21 and 85 ("voice packet"), and previously presented claims 5, 20 and 80 ("voice protocol").
[2] *See, e.g.*, previously presented claims 1 and 74.
[3] *Id.*

In particular, independent claims 1 and 74 now recite, in relevant part, a VOIP system comprising:

> at least one logic component facilitating communication between a target wireless device and a communication device, the target wireless device not supporting IP, the logic component undertaking method acts including:
> **transforming** *voice data in IP protocol* **to** *the wireless device OTA protocol*;
> sending *the voice data in the wireless device OTA protocol* to the target wireless device;
> **transforming** *voice data in the wireless device OTA protocol* from the target wireless device **to** *IP protocol*; and
> sending *the voice data in IP protocol* toward the communication device.

Further, independent claim 11 now recites:

> A method for communicating *voice data in IP* **to** a wireless device *not supporting Internet protocol (IP)*, comprising:
> **transforming** the *voice data in IP* **to** *an over-the-air (OTA) protocol different from IP*; and
> transmitting *the voice data in the OTA protocol* to the wireless device.

Additionally, independent claim 22 now recites a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium including:

> codes for causing a computer to **convert** *voice data in Internet protocol (IP)* from a communication system infrastructure **to** *voice data in over-the-air (OTA) protocol packets* to render first converted packets, *wherein the OTA protocol is different from IP*;
> codes for causing the computer to **convert** *voice data in OTA protocol packets* from a wireless device not supporting IP **to** *IP packets* to render second converted packets; and
> codes for causing the computer to provide communication between the wireless device and the infrastructure using the first and second converted packets.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dalal does not disclose, or even suggest, each and every one of the claimed subject matter, as amended.

Specifically, Dalal does not disclose or suggest *transforming/converting of voice data in IP to an OTA protocol different from IP*, as recited, but merely discloses separating traffic based on a traffic type. Dalal teaches that "voice traffic frames, data traffic frames, and signaling traffic frames" are sent by a frame selection unit 202 to a multiplexer-demultiplexer 204, which "***selectively relays*** frames to RLP unit 206, vocoder unit 208, [and] SDU control 210 ***according to frame type***." (emphasis added)[4] Dalal further clarifies that "[d]ata traffic frames are sent to RLP unit 206, voice traffic frames are sent to vocoder 208, and signal traffic frames are sent to SDU control 210."[5] Thus, Dalal separates traffic based on a traffic type, but does not disclose or suggest converting and/or transforming voice data in IP protocol to an OTA protocol different from IP, as recited by the present claims.

Additionally, with regard to voice data, rather than performing the recited transforming/converting of voice data in IP protocol to the OTA protocol different from IP, Dalal states that the vocoder 208 either compresses or decompresses the voice traffic.[6] The Examiner argues that the "IWF is used to convert between CDMA protocol and Internet protocol as evidenced from the architecture of Dalal,"[7] however, *the IWF is connected to the RLP 206 and thus is* ***only concerned with data traffic*** and ***not with the recited voice data***. Instead, Dalal discloses that the voice traffic is selectively relayed to/from the vocoder 208, which, as noted above, only compresses or decompresses the voice traffic. Thus, Dalal fails to disclose or suggest converting and/or transforming voice data in IP protocol to the OTA protocol different from IP, as recited by the present claims.

Further, Dalal does not disclose or suggest transforming/converting of voice data in IP protocol to the OTA protocol different from IP, and then sending/transmitting the voice data in the OTA protocol to a target wireless device not supporting IP. Dalal completely fails to address this subject matter.

Claims 2-10, 12, 17-21, 23-25, 27, 73, 75-78, 80-82, 84, 86, and 87 depend from respective ones of the independent claims, and thus are allowable for the same reasons. Further,

---

[4] Dalal, paragraph 31, lines 1-2 and 11-14.
[5] *Id.* at paragraph 32, lines 1-3; also, *see, e.g.*, paragraph 41.
[6] *Id.* at paragraph 34.
[7] Office Action mailed March 20, 2007, page 12.

each of these dependent claims separately recites subject matter not discloses or suggested by Dalal.

Therefore, since the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 13-16, 28, 69-72, 79, 83 and 85 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Based on the above reasoning, Dalal does not disclose or suggest the claimed limitations of claims 13-16, 28, 69-72, 79, 83 and 85, which depend from respective ones of the independent claims. Further, each of these dependent claims separately recites subject matter not discloses or suggested by Dalal.

Therefore, since the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 16, 2007

By: /Abdollah Katbab/
Abdollah Katbab, Reg. No. 45,325
858.651.4132

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502